LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

SUNDAY DEMOCRAT AND CHRONICLE, ROCHESTER, N.Y., JULY 9, 1989

Topfree not OK

CONCERNING the women arrested for public nudity, I hope Judge John Manning Regan will do what is right and uphold the law to protect the public in general.

The women are living in a dream world if they think that a women's breasts are not thought of as sexual. Just look at advertising in any of the media and you see that a woman's chest is not looked at the same as a man's.

Judge Herman J. Walz was incorrect to dismiss charges against the women in 1986. Their right to free speech was not violated, but the public's right to be protected from offensive behavior was.

Eileen Rochniak Irondequoit

Times-Union, Rochester, N.Y., Monday, July 10, 1989

Royko doesn't understand

MIKE ROYKO (July 1) says the "tops" law is wrong because it incorrectly assumes men lust at the sight of women's breasts. Women's breasts have aroused "lustful ideas" in men for ages. Too bad for Royko if he doesn't understand why.

Although he advocates the same topless rights for men and women, he claims women are different, for he admits women are aroused by baseball players' perky bottoms. He obviously will support the law that prohibits baseball players from playing without pants.

Allis D'Amanda Irondequoit

Times-Union, Rochester, N.Y., Monday, July 17, 1989

Put clothes back on

OVERLOOKED in the women-men bare chests nonsense is the fact that we already have a "sick society," damaged by sex acts on TV, magazines and rapes. Why make it worse?

Everybody should put their clothes back on. It would be especially nice to see the ladies wear dresses down to their ankles, like in the old days.

John (Doc) Herring Greece

Times-Union, Rochester, N.Y., Tuesday, July 11, 1989

Topfree is no big deal

I'VE read the letters written about the arrest of the topfree protesters. The writers are correct in a sense: There are bigger problems in the world to report on; the police should be put to better use than arresting peaceful picnickers.

I believe that's the whole point of the topfree protesters: What's the big deal about not wearing a shirt?

Yes, let's focus on more important issues and have our police force out fighting real crime instead of arresting a woman for wearing exactly what the man next to her is!

Let them be topfree and let's get on with more important issues!

Nina Randazza Petronio Rochester

SUNDAY DEMOCRAT AND CHRONICLE, ROCHESTER, N.Y., JULY 16, 1989

Why's skin 'indecent'?

FOR several days I have been pondering what the topfree women were arrested for. It has been reported as "exposure of a person" and "indecent exposure."

"Exposure of a person?" As near as I can figure it, George Eastman has been responsible for more exposures of people than anyone in history and I don't believe he was ever charged. I cannot wait to see what the courts come up with to define that phrase.

"Indecent exposure?" Wish I knew what "indecent" meant. One definition has it as "offensive to public morality." When one considers public morality as condoning or ignoring Salem witch trials, slavery, subjugation of an entire sex and the desecration and destruction of he ecosystem, I have problems accepting the ethical superiority of "public morality."

A synonym for "indecent" is "immodest" (i.e. humble, unpretentious). I cannot reconcile how complete exposure is less modest or pretentious than wearing skimpy garments designed to flatter by accentuating some characteristics and sublimating others: Show some skin in one area but hide the appendectomy scar.

If nothing else, more exposure of more bodies may help break down some hangups about physical attractiveness. If all types of bodies are presented unadorned, maybe there would be less self-consciousness in not comparing favorably with the current fashionables: Marilyn Monroe of the '50s vs. Twiggy of the '60s or Charles Atlas of the '50s vs. Mel Gibson of the '80s. Maybe people would stop dwelling so much on physical beauty and start paying attention to intrinsic beauty.

Richard LaPointe Rochester